

Site West Lake Land Fill 7ES  
ID # MSD079900932  
Break 10 9 out #2  
Other Workplan Comments  
3-7-95

C O V E R

FAX

S H E E T

To Dough Borro  
Fax # 916 905 336 3533  
Subject Draft RI/FS Work Plan OU 2  
Date March 7 1995  
Pages 2 including this cover sheet

#### COMMENTS

Michael D Hokley Esq  
Spencer Fane Britt & Browne  
1400 Commerce Bank Building  
1000 Walnut Street  
Kansas City Missouri 64106



40057480  
SUPEPFUND RECORDS

Dear Mr Hockley

I have completed my review of the Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan West Lake Land Fill Operable Unit 2. The entire document appears to be biased toward the selection of the presumptive remedy for landfills as the remedial alternative for the site. In fact there is a good probability that the presumptive remedy will be the one chosen as appropriate for this site. However the Remedial Investigation should be conducted to completely characterize the site while ensuring that sufficient information is gathered to support the implementation of the presumptive remedy should it be chosen. It is not necessary to have the work plan revised however I want to emphasize that it is not a foregone conclusion that the presumptive remedy for landfills will be selected for this site.

The following are my review comments

- 1 The last sentence of section 2.2.3.1.6 on page 213 appears to be missing something and should be completed
- 2 In section 2.4.3.1 on page 233 the next to the last paragraph which states that the industrial waste is not subject to management as hazardous waste leaves an impression that is incorrect and

From the desk of

Steven E Kinser  
Remedial Project Manager  
United States Environmental Protection Agency  
726 Minnesota Avenue  
Kansas City Kansas 66101

913 551 7728  
Fax 913-551 7063

should be corrected. Perhaps the addition of the phrase "under RCRA" should be added to the end of the sentence.

- 3 For completeness the owners of Operable Unit 01 Areas 1 & 2 should be added to figure 2.18
- 4 Section 5.2.6 discusses the determination of seep locations and sampling. There is no discussion of how the seeps will be identified and what criteria will be used to define a seep. Will the survey be ongoing or a one time shot? Will the survey look at wet weather seeps or those which are more or less perennial?
- 5 Section 5.2.6 further discusses the collection of one surface water and sediment sample from the Earth City retention pond. How will the location of those samples be selected? It is important that the location selected is representative of the potential for contamination resulting from the proximity to the landfill.

I am in general satisfied with the work plan and its contents. However, there are some remaining issues. Specifically, the work plan is to be the document that directs all aspects of the work to be accomplished during the RI/FS. The document presented does not do that; it only gives the general approach that is to be used in the project. I understand the economies to be achieved by following on with the work for OU1. At the same time I am unable to state with certainty that the work plan specifically addresses everything that it should. I consider the work plan submitted as an umbrella document which will cover subsequent documents that will fill in the details. I expect subsequent submissions such as the Field Sampling and Analysis Plan to contain much higher levels of detail. I expect subsequent submissions such as the Field Sampling and Analysis to contain greater level of detail. I expect that there will be written procedures that will provide clear concise directions concerning every aspect of the RI/FS. Specific references to methods and guidance procedures will be necessary rather than statements that EPA guidance will be followed.

Steven E. Kinser  
Remedial Project Manager  
Superfund Division  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

C O V E R

S H E E T

FAX

To Doug Eorr  
 Fax # 905 336 3533  
 Subject Draft RI/FS Work Plan OU 2  
 Date March 7 1995  
 Pages 2 includ g h s c v e r h e e t

## COMMENTS

Michael D Hockley Esq  
 Spencer Fane Britt & Browne  
 1400 Commerce Bank Building  
 1000 Walnut Street  
 Kansas City Missouri 64108

Dear Mr Hockley

I have completed my review of the Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan West Lake Landfill Operable Unit 2. The entire document appears to be biased toward the selection of the presumptive remedy for landfills as the remedial alternative for the site. In fact the entire document virtually the presumptive remedy will be the one chosen is appropriate for this site. However the Remedial Investigation should be conducted to completely characterize the site while ensuring that sufficient information is gathered to support the implementation of the presumptive remedy should it be chosen. It is not necessary to have the work plan revised however I want to emphasize that it is not a foregone conclusion that the presumptive remedy for landfills will be selected for this site.

The following are my review comments

- 1 The last sentence of section 2.2.3.1.6 on page 213 appears to be missing something and should be completed
- 2 In section 2.4.3.1 on page 233 the next to the last paragraph which states that the industrial site is not subject to management as hazardous waste leaves an impression that is incorrect and

From head office  
 Steven E. Knapp  
 Remedial Project Manager  
 United States Environmental Protection Agency  
 726 Mission Avenue  
 Kansas City, Kansas 66101  
 913-551-7726  
 Fax 913-551-0663

## TRANSMISSION REPORT

THIS DOCUMENT (REDUCED SAMPLE ABOVE)  
 WAS SENT

\*\* COUNT \*\*  
 # 2

\*\*\* SEND \*\*\*

NO	REMOTE STATION I D	START TIME	DURATION	#PAGES	COMMENT
1	905 336 3533	3- 7-95 13 10	1 45	2	

TOTAL 0 01 45 2

XEROX TELECOPIER 7020